

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner, Mr. Zachary Pape, for his courtesies extended to applicant's representatives during the Telephonic Interview conducted on March 19, 2009, and for his assistance in furthering prosecution on the merits of the instant application. During the Telephonic Interview, the objection to the drawing was discussed, as well as the subject matter of dependent claims 16-18. An agreement with respect to an amendment to claim 16 to overcome the objection to the drawing was reached. The following remarks take into account the content of the Telephonic Interview.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation, the indication that claims 14, 15, 17 and 18 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 14 and 19-21 have been canceled. Claims 9-13 and 15-18 are now currently pending, with claims 9 and 13 being the only independent claims. Claims 9, 13, 15 and 16 have been amended. Independent claims 9 and 13 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled dependent claim 14. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for allegedly failing to show every feature of the claimed invention specified in the claims. According to the Examiner, "the at least one power section and said at least one control section are physically separate from one another as per claim 16, the control section comprising elements which are arranged in said at least one power section as per claim 17, and the at least one power section comprises elements which are arranged in said at

least one control section as per claim 18 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)”.

Dependent claim 16 has been amended to recite that the “at least one power section and said at least one control section are spatially separate from one another”. As explained at paragraph [0019] of the specification as originally filed states that “[i]t is particularly advantageous to provide partition walls 6, 7 between the power section 3 and the control section 2, these partition walls extending as far as the common printed circuit board 4 and dividing the housing 5 into two regions which are closed off from one another”. The partition walls 6, 7 are shown in the figure (see reference designations 6, 7). These partition walls provide the spatial separation between the power section 3 and the control section 2. Therefore, the drawing shows the recitations of dependent claim 16. Withdrawal of this objection to the drawing is therefore in order.

Regarding “the control section comprising elements which are arranged in said at least one power section” as recited in dependent claim 17 and “the at least one power section comprises elements which are arranged in said at least one control section” as recited in dependent claim 18, paragraph [0022] of the instant specification states that “it is also entirely possible to place elements which are typical of the power section in the region of the control section … [and that it] is equally possible to place components which are typical of the control section in the power section”. Moreover, dependent claims 17 and 18 were previously amended to recite that the elements are arranged in a region of the at least one power section or at least one control section. The figure shows elements that are arranged in a region of the power control section and/or the control section, such as close to the partition 6. Therefore, the drawing does depict the recitations of dependent claims 17 and 18. Withdrawal of these objections to the drawing is also in order.

Since independent claim 9 and 13 were amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claim 14 (now canceled), which was indicated to contain allowable subject matter, as noted previously, applicant submits that independent claims 9 and 13 as now amended are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 10-12 depend from independent claim 9 and dependent claims 15-18 depend from independent claim 13, and are therefore allowable because independent claims 9 and 13 are allowable. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment.

The application is deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: March 27, 2009